UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,376	02/23/2004	Arvind Sundararajan	BEAS-01391US1	8926

23910 7590 11/29/2006

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
PATEL, MANGLESH M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,376	SUNDARARAJAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *(Amendment) September 8, 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/8/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **FINAL** action is responsive to the amendment received on 09/8/2006.

2. In the amendment Claims 1-10 were canceled and claim 11-22 are pending. Claims 11, 15 and 19 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 09/8/2006 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Withdrawn Objections

4. The Objection to the specification has been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Withdrawn Rejections

5. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 7 and 10 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

6. The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejections of claims 1-10 with cited reference of Song (NPL—REPOX: An XML Repository For Workflow Designs And Specifications, University of Georgia) has been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 13-14, 17-18 & 21-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claim contains incorrect spelling of Query, appropriate correction are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 12, 15-16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Pub 2003/0196168, filed Apr 10, 2002).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 15 and 19, Hu discloses a computer-implemented method comprising: Converting first XML data into second XML data having a different shape (paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33, wherein XML data is converted into second XML data has represented in the UML format. UML describes the modeling of the XML data including shapes, furthermore UML is described in XMI or Extensible Metadata interchange which incorporates among four standards including XML); and converting the second XML data to JAVA data (paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33, wherein the second data represented in the modeling format is converted to java). Although Hu doesn't explicitly mention shapes the specification indicates on pg 4, paragraph 17 "Shape refers to the way in which data is laid out and structured", UML is a modeling language and includes different shape representations of objects, the shapes include a different layout and structure of the data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention to include different shapes for conversion between languages. The motivation for doing so would have been to have language specific shapes for modeling different languages.

Regarding Dependent claims 12, 16 and 20, Hu discloses wherein the second XML data has the same shape as the JAVA data (paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33, wherein the XML data in UML format is used to convert into a Java format). Although Hu doesn't explicitly mention shapes the specification indicates on pg 4, paragraph 17 "Shape refers to the way in which data is laid out and structured", UML is a modeling language and includes different shape representations of objects, the shapes include a different layout and structure of the data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention to include different shapes for conversion between languages. The motivation for doing so would have been to have language specific shapes for modeling different languages.

10. Claims 13-14, 17-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Pub 2003/0196168, filed Apr 10, 2002) in view of Sutherland (U.S. 7,054,858, filed Aug 1, 2001).

Regarding Dependent claims 13, 17 and 21, Hu teaches the conversion of XML to an UML format and then to a JAVA format, wherein the UML represents a secondary modeling format of the XML data (paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33). Hu fails to teach the use of Xquery for relating the XML data to the Java objects. Sutherland discloses wherein XQuery is used to convert the first XML data to the second XML data (column

2, lines 20-67, wherein source and target data are retrieved and mapped using query language. Hu teaches the conversion from a first xml format to a second xml representation in a modeling format see paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Xquery for converting the first XML data to second XML data. The motivation for doing so would have been access portions of the XML data capable of conversion by using Xquery.

Regarding Dependent claims 14, 18 and 22, Hu teaches the conversion of XML to an UML format and then to a JAVA format, wherein the UML represents a secondary modeling format of the XML data. (Paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33). Hu fails to teach the use of Xquery for relating the XML data to the Java objects. Sutherland discloses wherein a query engine converts the second XML data into the JAVA data (column 2, lines 20-67, wherein Sutherland teaches the use of a query language for accessing the source and target data. Whereas Hu teaches the conversion of the second XML data describe din the UML modeling format to the Java data.see Paragraphs 4, 8-9 & 33. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Xquery for converting the first XML data to second XML data. The motivation for doing so would have been access portions of the XML data capable of conversion by using Xquery.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

11. No Arguments were filed on 9/8/06. Furthermore new references have been cited in light of the amendment.

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Nemer (U.S. Pub 2003/0110446) discloses "Object Class For Facilitating Conversion Between Java And XML"
- Moore et al. (U.S. 6,560,769) discloses "Computer-Implemented Method For Generating A UML Representation From Java Source Code"
- Najmi (U.S. 6,687,848) discloses "Techniques For Preventing Information Loss In A Business To Business Message In An Enterprise Computer System"
- Boughannam (U.S. Pub 2003/0014439) discloses "Defining A Markup Language Representation For State Chart Data"
- Stone et al. (U.S. 6,804,686) discloses "System And Methodology For Providing Fixed UML Layout For An Object Oriented Class Browser"
- Baisley et al. (U.S. 6,408,311) discloses "Method For Identifying UML Objects In A Repository With Objects In XML Content"
- Glebov et al. (U.S. 6,343,265) discloses "System And Method For Mapping A Design Model To A Common Repository With Context Preservation"
- Baisley et al. (U.S. 6,292,932) discloses "System And Method For Converting From One Modeling Language To Another"
- Baisley et al. (U.S. 6,330,569) discloses "Method For Versioning A UML Model In A Repository In Accordance With AN Updated XML Representation OF the UML Model"
- Mongeon et al. (U.S. Pub 2004/0260715) discloses "Object Mapping Across Multiple Different Data Stores"
- Saulpaugh et al. (U.S. 6,850,979) discloses "Message Gates In Distributed Computing Environment"
- Bau (U.S. Pub 2004/0216086) discloses "XML Types In Java"
- Slaughter et al. (U.S. 6,918,084) discloses "Spawning New Repository Spaces Using Information Provided In Advertisement Schema Messages"

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
November 21, 2006

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER